A U M

No atom of matter, in the whole vastness of the universe, is lost; how then can man's soul, which comprises the whole world in one idea be lost?—THE TALMUD.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXVIII April, 1940 No. 6

THE SELF-BEING

THE Secret Doctrine holds that we are full of kingdoms of entities which depend upon us for salvation. Each of these beings, which are said to number more than three hundred millions, is an intelligence, a *life*—a "god" accorded a distinctive name and place in the Hindu Pantheon. We may think of the seven human principles as representing seven great degrees of these intelligent lives, all participating in the macrocosmic Man, acting according to their natures and interacting according to their differences. The patterned play of all these beings makes the living balance, the dynamic equilibrium we call a human being.

What, then, is the man himself? Where, among the countless deities who work unceasingly to perform the actions man thinks to be his own, shall we seek *him*? Is there a self apart from all these beings, and if there is, how can it be known, or known at all? This is the great question.

Following David Hume, the West believes that self-knowledge is a mere chimera. Hume wrote: "When I enter most intimately into what I call *myself,* I always stumble on some particular perception or other. . . . I never catch mself without perception, and never can observe anything but the perception." Hume found the gods, but not the self. For John Dewey, the self is composed of "complex, unstable, opposing attitudes, habits, impulses which gradually come to terms with one another, and assume a certain consistency of configuration." No more than Hume, can he imagine a self behind "activities."

Clearly, there is no hope of self-knowledge from these sources. But by contrast, the tradition of western skepticism may serve as a challenge to those who follow quite another path of learning. What, actually, does the student of Theosophy know of Self? And how does he regard the facts which led Hume and Dewey to their common conclusion? The facts are real, although the conclusion be wrong. No wave of the hand and epithet of "Materialism" will

suffice to dispose of this problem. Because some men have made wrong use of certain facts, others are not justified in ignoring them. On the contrary, only by recognizing and understanding the facts can the mistaken conclusion be avoided.

Logically, the Self, as independent of all action and experience, is only an inference. There *must* be, we say, that which considers all these things, which perceives the "complex, unstable, opposing attitudes" described by Dr. Dewey. *That,* we say, is the Self, as a necessary inference from the fact of perception and reflection. But an inference is not knowledge. There is no *knowledge* of Self until the abstract idea of the individual perceiving self gradually assumes the dimensionless reality of the One Self. The separate self is abstract and unknowable because it is non-existent: *the Self is One.* Logic deals with differences, but the Self is difference-*less*; hence, logic makes of self a mere abstraction or denies it altogether.

The three hundred million gods embodied in the manifested man are forms and expressions of the Self. What knowledge have we of these gods? Self-knowledge must include conscious perception of *their* knowledge.

The life of man is sustained by these myriads of organized lives. The functions of body, sensation, feeling, desire, and even of the mind, are carried on in virtual independence of the human will. Only at intervals—curiously rare, reflection will show—does man exert a consciously guiding force upon these hosts of lives. As body, the body functions efficiently whether we regard it or not. We need not say to the heart, "Beat," nor to the lungs, "Breathe." The mind does not think only as we direct it—it thinks unceasingly. What do we know of the entities we name collectively our "mind"? Why do they rush out, seize some object of thought and turn it around and about, striving to penetrate its essence? What have we to do with "mind"? What is the "I" that has a mind, and is it "his"?

There is a wise one who rises up within a man when life hangs in the balance; when wisdom which does not reason, but knows, is required. Who is that one? Is he the Self?

When we can answer these questions, each one for himself, and be ourselves satisfied with the answers—then is Self-knowledge beginning to be born.

The Self is in all these beings; It is the maker, preserver, destroyer of them all. But the Self is no being, however great; the gods may be glorious, but the Self is One. He who knows the Self, is, and knows, all the gods, and yet is none of them. The Self is all, or no-thing, as It wills; that is why the Self alone is free.

THE ASTRAL BODY

Historical Studies: IV

A PASSAGE from a French mystic of the time of Descartes will serve to show that the idea of the astral body was then not uncommon in Europe. This writer, Pierre Poiret, was a Christian minister who explained a difficult passage in the Scripture by means of the astral body. He believed "that the body which the soul parts with at death is only of the nature of an outer bark or envelope, beneath which is a real body of subtle matter to which the soul is inseparably united." It was, he thought, "these subtle bodies made visible which appeared to the favored disciples who beheld Moses and Elias discussing with Jesus at the Transfiguration."[1] A similar curiosity of belief in a much later time is cited by W. E. H. Lecky. After observing that the Cartesian doctrine "destroyed forever the old notion of an inner body," he notes as an exception its survival in nineteenth century Christian thought in the writings of Edward Hitchcock, American Congregational clergyman and geologist. In his *Religion of Geology* and *Lectures on the Seasons,* Dr. Hitchcock availed himself of Reichenbach's studies of "odic light" to construct a theory of the "bodies of the blessed."[2]

Known to the western world in such contexts, it was impossible that the doctrine of an invisible, subtle body could survive the criticisms of scientific rationalism. The astral body was condemned because medievalism was condemned. An extract taken from Lange's *History of Materialism* makes clear the spirit in which the astral body was and is regarded by men of science and modern philosophy. The great Descartes had defined animals as mere automata—machines. As Lange says:

> The step from the animal to man was then but a short one; and, moreover, here also Descartes had so prepared the way, that he may fairly be regarded as the immediate forerunner of outspoken materialism. In his treatise "Passiones Animae," he calls attention to the important fact that the dead body is not only dead because the soul is wanting to it, but because the bodily machine itself is partially destroyed. If we reflect that the entire sum of the idea of the soul possessed by primitive peoples is due to the comparison of the living and the dead body, and that the ignorance of the physiological phenomena in the dying body is one of the strongest supports of a "visionary soul"—that is, of that *more subtle man* who is supposed

---

[1] Quoted by Herbert Wildon Carr, *The Monadology of Leibniz* (Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1930), p. 85.

[2] *Rationalism in Europe* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1884), I, 346.

> by the popular psychology to be present as the motive force in the inside of the man—we shall immediately recognize in this single point an important contribution to the carrying out of anthropological Materialism. And not less important is the unambiguous recognition of Harvey's great discovery of the circulation of the blood. With this the whole Aristotelo-Galenian physiology fell to the ground; and although Descartes still held to the "vital spirits," they are at least in him entirely free from that mystical antithesis between matter and spirit, and from the incomprehensible relations of "sympathy" and "antipathy" to half-sensible half-supersensible "spirits" of all kinds. With Descartes the vital spirits are genuine, materially-conceived matter, more logically imagined than Epikuros' soul-atoms, with their added element of caprice. They move themselves and effect movement, just as in Demokritos, exclusively according to mathematical and physical laws. A mechanism of pressure and collision, which Descartes follows out with great ingenuity through all the separate steps, forms an uninterrupted chain of effects produced by external things through the senses upon the brain, and from the brain back again outwards through nerves and muscular filaments.[3]

In brief, the intellectual outlook which followed the Renaissance discarded the cardinal conceptions of ancient philosophy because they had been misappropriated and distorted into artificial consistency with theological dogma and superstition. For the true idea of the Initiates who are the knowers and guardians of the traditional wisdom of the race, the Christians had substituted the Church as a divine institution, the repository of all ultimate truth, making the latter accessible to men only through its ordained priests, in particular the Roman pontiff, who was endowed with infallibility on the ultimate questions of faith and morals. For the body of knowledge known to Sages and Adepts, the Christians had substituted the revelation of the Bible, which was interpreted by the Fathers, given dogmatic form by the Church Councils, and made "logical" by the theologians. The result of these corruptions was that in rejecting the authority of the Church and the "truths" of revelation, the great champions of Reason left unconsidered the possible existence of a body of ascertained and ultimately verifiable knowledge such as Theosophy. The very idea that spiritual knowledge might be possessed by men who had no desire to act as spiritual "dictators" was virtually inconceivable to anyone who knew only European history.

This enthronement of skeptical rationalism produced several

---

[3] *Op. cit.* I, 245-6.

important consequences. The doctrine of the noumenal causes of phenomena—the Platonic Ideas—was dropped in favor of the exoteric atomism of the Greek materialists.[4] The Newtonian physics with its demonstrable laws of motion gave an attractive mathematical scheme to this mechanical view. The ancient conception of the soul in man as an independent principle, with powers and knowledge of its own, gave way to the bare abstraction of Self-consciousness as formulated by Descartes. Although Descartes granted that certain ideas, such as that of God, are innate, the Platonic doctrine of Reminiscence could find no place in his philosophy. With the denial of inner soul-knowledge, theorists turned to sensation, to bodily experience, as the source of all our ideas. This led to empiricism in science, to sensationalism in psychology, and to skepticism in philosophy. Lamettrie may be taken as a type of the founders of modern materialism, on the side of its logical justification; the English succession of Locke, Berkeley and Hume represents the line of thought which seemed to end in pessimistic skepticism, offering blind belief in revelation as the sole alternative to the delusions of the senses; and Kant, by a careful analysis of the nature of thought, showed that purely logical inquiry is incapable of establishing the first principles of philosophy—that for this, knowledge of another order than the intellectual is required. Hence, from the rational point of view, we can know nothing about God, the Soul, and Immortality. Our beliefs on these subjects, Kant insisted, must have their ground in the moral nature of man, in the intuitive "ought" which is immediately given in human consciousness. Then came the great materialistic *tour de force* of the nineteenth century—Darwinism. It remained only for the anthropologists to argue that human consciousness is an efflorescence of animal evolution, that the moral sense is a development of the "herd" instinct, for the victory of materialism to be complete.

Surveying this course of intellectual inquiry in the West, one sees why the Adepts speak with such immeasurable pity of the "great orphan, Humanity."

There was one brave soul who in the sixteenth century set going a strong current of truth, but whose efforts, except for their leavening influence, were in vain. The philosophical side of the teachings of Paracelsus was submerged in the rising tide of materialism, although historians of medicine today admit that he was a great contributor to that science. The doctrine of the astral body, how-

---

[4] *Cf. Isis Unveiled* I, 8; *The Secret Doctrine* I, 117-18, 567-8.

ever, is regarded as merely one of the many fancies which mar his works. The occult synthesis of Paracelsian teachings was fated to be lost to the West until the time of H. P. B. Only so long as there were true disciples of Paracelsus in the world could the living value of his work be maintained. His *occult* influence probably ended with the death in 1692 of Elias Ashmole, the last of the real Rosicrucians.[5]

The portion of the teaching of Paracelsus which deals with the astral body is summarized by H. P. B.:

> "Three spirits live and actuate man," teaches Paracelsus; "three worlds pour their beams upon him; but all three only as the image and echo of one and the same all-constructing and uniting principle of production. The first is the spirit of the elements (terrestrial body and vital force in its brute condition); the second, the spirit of the stars (sidereal or astral body—the soul); the third is the *Divine* spirit (Augoeides)." Our human body, being possessed of "primeval earth-stuff," as Paracelsus calls it, we may readily accept the tendency of modern scientific research "to regard the processes of both animal and vegetable life as simply physical and chemical." This theory only corroborates the assertions of old philosophers and the *Mosaic Bible,* that from the dust of the ground our bodies were made, and to dust they will return. But we must remember that
>
> " 'Dust thou art, to dust returneth,'
> Was not spoken of the soul."
>
> Man is a little world—a microcosm inside the great universe. Like a foetus, he is suspended, by all his *three* spirits, in the matrix of the macrocosmos; and while his terrestrial body is in constant sympathy with its parent earth, his astral soul lives in union with the sidereal *anima mundi.*[6]

Plants and animals, in common with man, have an astral body, according to Paracelsus. In man it is the medium for the reception of sidereal influences and accounts also for telepathy, prophetic dreams, and other forms of prescience. "To our elementary and grosser body these gifts are not imparted, for at death it descends into the bosom of the earth and is reunited to the physical elements, while the several spirits return to the stars." "The animals," he adds, "have also their presentiments, for they too have an astral body."

Chief among the English followers of Paracelsus was Robert Fludd, early seventeenth century adept-physician. In this period there was a wide circle of Rosicrucian and Kabalistic students of the occult doctrines of Paracelsus in England as well as on the

[5] *Isis* II, 349. [6] *Ibid.* I, 212.

continent. The streams of influence coming from Paracelsus, from the Kabalism of Reuchlin and Pico, and from the Platonic and Neoplatonic philosophy revived by the Florentine School, met in the thought of the English Cambridge Platonists. According to Dr. J. A. Stewart, Henry More borrowed the term "astral body" from the Paracelsians.[7] The Cambridge Platonists, therefore, in their opposition to the mechanical philosophy inspired by Descartes and Hobbes, drew arguments for a "plastic principle" from the teachings of Paracelsus.

Jean Baptiste van Helmont, born in Brussels in 1577, was perhaps the most notable of the disciples of Paracelsus. Fournié, the French physiologist, credits van Helmont with "connecting *the principle of life,* directly and in some sort experimentally, as he tells us, with the most minute movements of the body."

> It is the incessant action of this entity [Fournié wrote], in no way associated by him with the material elements, but forming a distinct individuality, that we cannot understand. Nevertheless, it is upon this entity that a famous school has laid its principal foundation.[8]

The "life principle" appears also in works attributed to Basil Valentine, a mysterious Benedictine once supposed to have lived before Paracelsus in the fifteenth century. Historians now believe, however, that the Valentine writings are a seventeenth century plagiarism of the books or Paracelsus.[9] The term *archaeus,* meaning "life principle," is common to both.

Following is a summary of van Helmont's doctrine of the life principle:

> Van Helmont . . . held that there was no soul residing in plants and in brute beasts, which possess only "a certain vital power . . . the forerunner of a soul." In man, the sensitive soul is the prime agent of all the functions of the body. It works by means of *archaei* its servants, which, in their turn, act directly in the organs of the body by means of ferments allied to that which gives us wine. The soul dwells in the *archaeus* of the stomach, in some such way as light is present in a burning candle. The sensitive soul is mortal, but co-exists in man with the immortal mind.[10]

The sensitive soul is thus the astral body, and, as H. P. B. explains, "Van Helmont's 'principle of life,' or *archaeus,* is neither more nor less than the astral light of all the kabalists, and the

---

[7] *The Myths of Plato* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1905), p. 95.
[8] *Physiologie du Systeme Nerveux* (Paris: 1872), p. 717; quoted in *Isis* I, 400.
[9] J. M. Stillman, "Basil Valentine," *Popular Science Monthly,* December, 1912.
[10] William Dampier, *History of Science* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1936), p. 134.

universal ether of modern science."[11] The basic conception of modern vitalism, therefore, goes back to Paracelsus. Historians of science, however, trace it to G. E. Stahl, who lived from 1660 to 1734, and was physician to the King of Prussia. Stahl also formulated the "phlogiston" theory of fire, which was discarded after the studies of friction by Count Rumford. In biological theory, Stahl stated the general principle held in one or another of its aspects by all the vitalists since his time:

> He [Stahl] maintained the view that all the changes of the living body, though they might superficially resemble ordinary chemical reactions, were yet fundamentally different, because they were directly governed by a sensitive soul, *anima sensitiva,* which pervaded all parts.
>
> Stahl's "sensitive soul," unlike that described by van Helmont, had no need of intermediaries—*archaei* or ferments. It controlled directly the chemical and other processes of the body. It differed entirely from the "rational soul" of Descartes' philosophy. To Descartes with his sharp dualism, the human body apart from the soul was a machine, governed by ordinary mechanical laws. To Stahl it was not governed by ordinary physical and chemical laws; but, as long as it was alive, it was controlled in all details by the sensitive soul on a plane far above physics and chemistry. The living body was fitted for special purposes—to be the true and continued temple of the soul, which built up the body and used it for vital ends. The link between soul and body, according to Stahl, was to be found in motion; the preservation and repair of structures, sensation and its concomitants, are modes directed by the sensitive soul. Thus Stahl was the founder of modern vitalism, though his "sensitive soul" passed later into a vaguer "vital principle."[12]

This brings us to the chief issue of modern biology—the controversy between the mechanists and the vitalists. The latter demand recognition for an indefinable "vital force" which, they say, is necessary to explain the phenomena of life. The mechanists deny this contention, and Aristotle-like, philosophers of science withhold judgment, awaiting further discoveries by biological science. Vitalists are generally viewed with disfavor because most biologists think a mysterious "vital force" has theological implications, and they cling to materialism as to dear life itself. It is not that they love materialism, but that they hate theology, which is regarded as the only alternative to the doctrines of dead matter and blind force. Once scientists become persuaded that a metaphysics without the familiar taint of dogma is entirely possible, then they may look a

[11] *Isis* I, 400.

[12] Dampier, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

little higher for truth than in the blind method of empiricism and the mechanistic conception of natural law.

Returning to the origin of form, which the Platonists explained by the astral body, we find that this problem, along with that of the nature of "life," is involved in the dispute between the vitalists and the mechanists. The mechanistic objective was stated by Berthelot in 1860: "The objective of our science is to banish 'Life' from the theories of organic chemistry."[13] Until his time, chemists and biologists had regarded the "Life Force" in plants and animals as different from and independent of the merely physical and chemical forces of matter. It took several generations for the life sciences to eliminate the influence of Greek philosophy, with its several "souls" or "forms," and to assimilate the mechanical atomism and principles of physical motion established by the physicists and natural philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In the last century the attempt to "purify" biology of the Life Force theory—the last vestige of ancient truth—began in earnest. As biologists succeeded more and more in discovering the mechanics of living processes, the vital principle became more and more "abstract." The controversy, as it stood in 1925, is outlined by Bertrand Russell in his Introduction to Lange's *History of Materialism:*

> In our own time, the old battle of materialism persists chiefly in biology and physiology. Some men of science maintain that the phenomena of living organisms cannot be explained solely in terms of chemistry and physics; others maintain that such explanation is always theoretically possible. Professor J. S. Haldane may be regarded, in this country [England], as the leading exponent of the former view; in Germany it is associated with Driesch. One of the most effective champions of the mechanistic view was Jacques Loeb, who showed (*inter alia*) that a sea urchin could have a pin for its father, and afterwards extended this result to animals much higher in the scale. The controversy may be expected to last for a long time, since, even if the mechanists are in the right, they are not likely soon to find explanations of all vital phenomena of the sort that their theory postulates. It will be a severe blow to the vitalists when protoplasm is manufactured in the laboratory, but they will probably take refuge in saying that their theories only apply to multi-cellular organisms. Later, they will confine vitalism to vertebrates, then to mammals, then to men, and last of all to white men—or perhaps it will be yellow men by that time. Ordinary scientific probability

[13] For a statement of the mechanists' position by a biochemist, see "The Revolt of the Biochemists," by Dr. P. A. Levene, *Science,* July 10, 1931.

> suggests, however, that the sphere of mechanistic explanation in regard to vital phenomena is likely to be indefinitely extended by the progress of biological knowledge.[14]

It is easy to see where Mr. Russell's sympathies lie—or lay, in 1925. Typical of most modern philosophers, this view is not difficult to understand when we examine its genesis, which may be found illustrated in Lamettrie's *L'Homme Machine,* published in 1748. Defending Atheism, Lamettrie attacks the claim that we know God exists because of the design manifest in Nature. He quotes from Diderot the assertion that "one could slay the Atheist with a butterfly's wing or with the eye of a gnat, while one had the weight of the universe with which to crush him."[15] The French materialist then proceeds to refute Diderot's arguments, citing as evidence against the creative artifice of a personal God *precisely the sort of scientific discovery that is today used by the vitalists to support their arguments!*

Lamettrie did not deny the existence of Deity, but objected to the God of Christian dogma. He maintained that the world would never be happy until it was atheistic. "If Atheism were universally disseminated," he said, "all the branches of religion would be torn up by the roots. Then there would be no more theological wars: there would no longer be soldiers of religion, that terrible kind of soldier."[16] Obviously, religion does not bring morality, and there is historical evidence that Atheism does not exclude it.

With these motives for his materialism, Lamettrie turned to the then meager resources of experimental science for his arguments against the Christian doctrine of creation. In the years 1744-7, Abraham Trembley, a Swiss naturalist, had published his *Memoirs on Fresh-Water Polypes,* providing Lamettrie with the needed material. Trembley had cut a polyp in several pieces, and in eight days each fragment grew into a whole organism capable of reproducing itself. Lamettrie urged this wonderful fact as proof that we have not sufficient knowledge of the powers of Nature to deny that she produces everything out of herself. What need of a God of whom we know nothing, when Nature demonstrates such creative potency? His own opinion was that the forms of nature arise from the pressures of the particles of one body on the particles of another —Atomism, in short. The life principle is reduced to animating

---

[14] *Op. cit.* I, xvii-iii.

[15] *Ibid.* II, 71-2. It is curious to find Diderot, the greatest of the Encyclopedists, appearing to attack Atheism. Lamettrie seems to have taken too seriously Diderot's half-hearted pose of Deism.

[16] *Ibid.*, 73.

tiny fibres of the body, stirring to action these biological "atoms."[17] The affinities of this theory with current speculations about viruses and genes are clearly apparent.

Living bodies, whether animal or human, are simply machines developed by Nature herself. This, Lamettrie claimed, is what we learn from experiment and observation. A century and a half later a German biologist, Hans Driesch, claimed that exactly the same kind of experiment and observation disproved the machine hypothesis. In the first decade of the twentieth century Driesch began publishing the results of experiments on sea urchins. He had found that any fragment cut at random from the blastula (an early stage of embryo) always grew into a complete embryo. This and similar experiments became the foundation for a closely reasoned argument that the functions of protoplasm cannot be explained mechanically. The organism, he holds, is "a harmonious equipotential system possessing a vital individualizing *entelechy* which works through matter with a view to the whole."[18] Thus, Driesch's proofs of vitalism are Lamettrie's proofs of mechanism.

"Explanations" revolve around unchanging facts as planets about a sun, first one, then another interpretation, often of opposite significance, becoming the prevailing "climate of opinion." In Lamettrie's time, freedom-loving men saw in Materialism a high-road to Utopia: a godless world, they thought, would be a world emancipated from the nameless horrors of religious wars and persecution. Thus modern mechanism had originally a *moral* sanction! In the present, the tragic consequences of Materialism are painfully evident, with signs of reaction appearing even in scientific thought. Here and there are those who regard Nature through unbiased eyes, and occasionally one hears the mechanical theory condemned as an absurdity. Mindful of the past, and dreading the inevitable priestly exploitation of every hypothesis hinting at metaphysics, they proceed with great caution; nevertheless, they proceed.

It is during these periods of *transition* that much of the work of the Theosophical Movement is accomplished, for the minds of men are open and there is opportunity to present the philosophic principles which synthesize the half-truths of both religion and science. The remaining articles of this series will show how closely modern biology has approached the "fact" of the astral body, although only a glimmer of the true significance of this research is as yet reflected in scientific literature.

---

[17] *Ibid.*, 72-6.

[18] *Encyc. Brit.* VII, 662 (14th ed.).

THE HEART'S DESIRE

JULIAN, Initiate-Emperor of Rome, was sad because the Gods of the ancients, whom he loved and revered, were losing their eternal youth. Indeed, the Gods were old in Julian's time, and are older still today, passing almost from memory. But there is one God, Eros, called by Plato the eldest, who has lived on in modern fancy, although he is the most misunderstood of all the pagan deities. The smiling cupid of today grins and blinks, blissfully unaware that his small person is a symbol of glory lost and forgotten; elfish and mischievous, he smiles, for he is a child and so will remain—a child of human thinking.

Cupid was not always a mere sprite of romance. The myth in which Aphrodite, mother of Eros, is born from the foam of the sea veils a profound meaning. An anonymous Greek poet phrased the story thus:

> It is strange how thou camest, Aphrodite, all wet from
> the sea that is gray,
> But red and forever afire is this fruit of thyself
> and the spray!

Aphrodite, or Venus, in her higher aspect is the great Mother-Virgin of Nature, Primordial Matter; hence, Eros is Divine Will or Desire of manifesting itself through visible creation. The Tibetan name for the great power of Eros is *Fohat*—that which "causes the elemental atoms to aggregate and combine." By the uniting power of "love," harmony and order are made to arise out of the sea of Chaos, which represents the primordial ocean of Space. "Fohat, in its various manifestations, is the mysterious link between Mind and Matter, the animating principle electrifying every atom into life."

Interwoven with every human experience are the two great "feelings," Love and Hate, which run through all nature. In the mineral kingdom it is sympathy or affinity which draws the iron filings to the magnet, even as "aversion" makes it impossible for certain chemical elements to combine. These two qualities are found in every atom as in every man.

The Pythagorean thaumaturgist, Empedocles, taught that all things are caused to take on form through the attractions and repulsions of Love and Hate. "For of a truth," he says, "they were aforetime and shall be; nor ever, methinks, will boundless time be emptied of that pair." For Empedocles, Aphrodite symbolizes the

principle of cohesion, or Love. "All things that are more adapted for mixture are like to one another and united in love by Aphrodite." "It is she that is known as being implanted in the frame of mortals. It is she that makes them have thoughts of love and work the works of peace." The "Strife" of Empedocles was the tendency of unlike things to combine, which caused the first differentiation in the One; then "Love," acting as a contrary force during manifestation, became the organizing principle by which the forms of life are evolved.

Like Pythagoras and the great Aryan Sages, Empedocles taught that all things arise from the One and return to the One. Life is a cycle of "Purifications," through which men come to adopt the principle of Love as their guide, instead of the Strife which involves them in the circle of necessity or metempsychosis. Those who follow Strife "must wander thrice ten thousand years from the abodes of the blessed, being born throughout the time in all manners of mortal forms, changing one toilsome path for another. . . . One of these I now am, an exile and a wanderer from the gods, for that I put my trust in insensate strife."

In the manifested world, Eros, child of chaos, is "the ceaseless pulse and current of desire" in the gods, as well as in all nature, to create and give life to Beings. The principle of Love and its opposite, Strife, like man himself, persevere undying throughout beginningless eternities; the interrelations of these two forces, in varying harmonies or dissonances, constitute the experience of daily life.

All men are lovers of one thing or another. We have attractions for this, repulsions for that. The karma of our feeling nature is but the memory of loves and hates of the past. From these we may learn whether our love has been an *all-embracing desire* for the good of all that lives and feels, or mere cupidity. Even if love and hate are the two greatest feelings in the universe, we still can be master of the greatest, if we will. There is no feeling too strong, no thought too powerful for the will of man to re-create and give a new direction. We may understand the true use of the power of Eros when we think of the Compassion that overflows from one who lives to transmute experience into knowledge, passion into enthusiasm, all hates and personal attachments into their highest principle of universal or Divine Love.

PSYCHIC AND NOETIC ACTION

" . . . The knowledge of the past, present, and future, is embodied in Kshetrajna the 'Self')."—*Occult Axioms.*

II

HAVING explained in what particulars, and why, as Occultists, we disagree with materialistic physiological psychology, we may now proceed to point out the difference between psychic and noëtic mental functions, the noëtic not being recognized by official science.

Moreover, we, Theosophists, understand the terms "psychic" and "psychism" somewhat differently from the average public, science, and even theology, the latter giving it a significance which both science and Theosophy reject, and the public in general remaining with a very hazy conception of what is really meant by the terms. For many, there is little, if any, difference between "psychic" and "psychological," both words relating in some way to the *human* soul. Some modern metaphysicians have wisely agreed to disconnect the word Mind (*pneuma*) from Soul (*psyche*), the one being the rational, spiritual part, the other—*psyche*—the living principle in man, the breath that *animates* him (from *anima,* soul). Yet, if this is so, how in this case refuse a soul to *animals*? These are, no less than man, informed with the same principle of sentient life, the *nephesh* of the 2nd chapter of *Genesis*. The Soul is by no means the Mind, nor can an idiot, bereft of the latter, be called a "soul-less" being. To describe, as the physiologists do, the human Soul in its relations to senses and appetites, desires and passions, common to man and the brute, and then endow it with God-like intellect, with spiritual and rational faculties which can take their source but in a *supersensible* world—is to throw for ever the veil of an impenetrable mystery over the subject. Yet in modern science, "psychology" and "psychism" relate only to conditions of the nervous system, mental phenomena being traced solely to molecular action. The higher *noëtic* character of the Mind-Principle is entirely ignored, and even rejected as a "superstition" by both physiologists and psychologists. Psychology, in fact, has become a synonym in many cases for the science of psychiatry. Therefore, students of Theosophy being compelled to differ from all these, have adopted

---

NOTE—This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for November, 1890.

the doctrine that underlies the time-honored philosophies of the East. What it is, may be found further on.

To better understand the foregoing arguments and those which follow, the reader is asked to turn to the editorial in the September *Lucifer* ("The Dual Aspect of Wisdom," p. 3), and acquaint himself with the *double aspect* of that which is termed by St. James in his Third Epistle at once—the *devilish, terrestrial* wisdom, and the "wisdom from above." In another editorial, "Kosmic Mind" (April, 1890), it is also stated, that the ancient Hindus endowed every cell in the human body with consciousness, giving each the name of a God or Goddess. Speaking of atoms in the name of science and philosophy, Professor Ladd calls them in his work *"supersensible beings."* Occultism regards every atom[1] as an "independent entity" and every cell as a "conscious unit." It explains that no sooner do such atoms group to form cells, than the latter become endowed with consciousness, each of its own kind, and with *free-will to act within* the limits of law. Nor are we entirely deprived of scientific evidence for such statements as the two above named editorials well prove.* More than one learned physiologist of the golden minority, in our own day, moreover, is rapidly coming to the conviction, that memory has no seat, no special organ of its own in the human brain, but that it has *seats* in every organ of the body.

"No good ground exists for speaking of any special organ, or seat of memory," writes Professor J. T. Ladd.[2] "Every organ indeed, every area, and every limit of the nervous system has its own memory" (p. 553 *loc. cit.*).

The seat of memory, then, is assuredly neither here nor there, but everywhere throughout the human body. To locate its organ in the brain is to limit and dwarf the Universal Mind and its countless Rays (the *Manasa putra*) which inform every rational mortal. As we write for Theosophists, first of all, we care little for the psychophobian prejudices of the Materialists who may read this and sniff contemptuously at the mention of "Universal Mind" and the Higher *noëtic* souls of men. But, what *is* memory, we ask. "Both presentation of sense and image of memory, are transitory phases of consciousness," we are answered. But what is Consciousness itself? — we ask again. *"We cannot define Consciousness,"* Pro-

---

[1] One of the names of Brahmâ is *anu* or "atom."

* "The Dual Aspect of Wisdom" was reprinted in THEOSOPHY for February, 1940 (p. 160), and "Kosmic Mind" in December, 1939 (p. 60) and January, 1940 (p. 118). —Eds.

[2] Professor of Philosophy at Yale University.

fessor Ladd tells us.[3] Thus, that which we are asked to do by physiological psychology is, to content ourselves with controverting the various states of Consciousness by other people's private and unverifiable hypotheses; and this, on "questions of cerebral physiology *where experts and novices are alike ignorant,*" to use the pointed remark of the said author. Hypothesis for hypothesis, then we may as well hold to the teachings of our Seers, as to the conjectures of those who deny both such Seers and their wisdom. The more so, as we are told by the same honest man of science, that "if metaphysics and ethics cannot properly dictate their facts and conclusions to the science of physiological psychology . . . in turn this science cannot properly dictate to metaphysics and ethics the conclusions which they shall draw from facts of Consciousness, by giving out its myths and fables in the garb of well ascertained history of the cerebral processes" (p. 544).

Now, since the metaphysics of Occult physiology and psychology postulate within mortal man an immortal entity, "divine Mind," or *Nous,* whose pale and too often distorted reflection is that, which we call "Mind" and intellect in men—virtually an entity apart from the former during the period of every incarnation—we say that the *two* sources of "memory" are in these two "principles." These two we distinguish as the Higher *Manas* (Mind or Ego), and the *Kama-Manas, i. e.,* the rational, but earthly or physical intellect of man, incased in, and bound by, matter, therefore subject to the influence of the latter: the all-conscious SELF, that which reincarnates periodically—verily the WORD made flesh! — and which is always the same, while its reflected "Double," changing with every new incarnation and personality, is, therefore, conscious but for a life-period. The latter "principle" is the *Lower* Self, or that, which manifesting through our *organic* system, acting on this plane of illusion, imagines itself the *Ego Sum,* and thus falls into what Buddhist philosophy brands as the "heresy of separateness." The former, we term INDIVIDUALITY, the latter *Personality*. From the first proceeds all the *noëtic* element, from the second, the *psychic, i. e.,* "terrestrial wisdom" at best, as it is influenced by all the chaotic stimuli of the human or rather *animal passions* of the living body.

The "Higher Ego" cannot act directly on the body, as its consciousness belongs to quite another plane and planes of ideation: the "lower" *Self* does: and its action and behaviour *depend on its free will and choice* as to whether it will gravitate more towards its

[3] "Elements of Physiological Psychology."

parent ("the Father in Heaven") or the "animal" which it informs, the man of flesh. The "Higher Ego," as part of the essence of the UNIVERSAL MIND, is unconditionally omniscient on its own plane, and only potentially so in our terrestrial sphere, as it has to act solely through its *alter ego* — the Personal Self. Now, although the former is the vehicle of all knowledge of the past, the present, and the future, and although it is from this fountain-head that its "double" catches occasional glimpses of that which is beyond the senses of man, and transmits them to certain brain cells (unknown to science in their functions), thus making of man a *Seer,* a soothsayer, and a prophet; yet the memory of bygone events—especially of the earth earthy—has its seat in the Personal Ego alone. No memory of a purely daily-life function, of a physical, egotistical, or of a lower mental nature—such as, *e. g.,* eating and drinking, enjoying personal sensual pleasures, transacting business to the detriment of one's neighbor, etc., etc., has aught to do with the "Higher" Mind or Ego. Nor has it any direct dealings on this physical plane with either our brain or our heart—for these two are the organs of a power higher than the *Personality*—but only with our passional organs, such as the liver, the stomach, the spleen, etc. Thus it only stands to reason that the memory of such-like events must be first awakened in that organ which was the first to induce the action remembered afterwards, and conveyed it to our "sense-thought," which is entirely *distinct from the "super-sensuous" thought.* It is only the higher forms of the latter, the *superconscious* mental experiences, that can correlate with the cerebral and cardiac centres. The memories of physical and *selfish* (or personal) deeds, on the other hand, together with the mental experiences of a terrestrial nature, and of earthly biological functions, can, of necessity, only be correlated with the molecular constitution of various *Kamic* organs, and the "dynamical associations" of the elements of the nervous system in each particular organ.

Therefore, when Professor Ladd, after showing that every element of the nervous system has a memory of its own, adds:—"This view belongs to the very essence of every theory which considers conscious mental reproduction as only one form or phase of the biological fact of organic memory"—he must include among such theories the Occult teaching. For no Occultist could express such teaching more correctly than the Professor, who says, in winding up his argument: "We might properly speak, then, of the memory of the end-organ of vision or of hearing, of the memory of the spinal cord and of the different so-called 'centres' of reflex action belong-

ing to the chords of the memory of the medulla oblongata, the cerebellum, etc." This is the essence of Occult teaching—even in the Tantra works. Indeed, every organ in our body *has its own memory.* For if it is endowed with a consciousness "of its own kind," every cell must of necessity have also a memory of its own kind, as likewise its own *psychic* and *noëtic* action. Responding to the touch of both a physical and a *metaphysical* Force,[4] the impulse given by the *psychic* (or psycho-molecular) Force will act from *without within*; while that of the *noëtic* (shall we call it Spiritual-dynamical?) Force works *from within without.* For, as our body is the covering of the inner "principles," soul, mind, life, etc., so the molecule or the cell is the body in which dwell its "principles," the (to our senses and comprehension) immaterial atoms which compose that cell. The cell's activity and behavior are determined by its being propelled either inwardly or outwardly, by the noëtic or the psychic Force, the former having no relation to the *physical* cells proper. Therefore, while the latter act under the unavoidable law of the conservation and correlation of physical energy, the atoms—being psycho-spiritual, *not physical units—act under laws of their own,* just as Professor Ladd's "Unit-Being," which is our "Mind-Ego," does, in his very philosophical and scientific hypothesis. Every human organ and each cell in the latter has a keyboard of its own, like that of a piano, only that it registers and emits sensations instead of sounds. Every key contains the potentiality of good or bad, of producing harmony or disharmony. This depends on the impulse given and the combinations produced; on the force of the touch of the artist at work, a "double-faced Unity," indeed. And it is the action of this or the other "Face" of the Unity that determines the nature and the dynamical character of the manifested phenomena as a resulting action, and this whether they be physical or mental. For the whole life of man is guided by this double-faced Entity. If the impulse comes from the "Wisdom above," the Force applied being noëtic or spiritual, the results will be actions worthy of the divine propeller; if from the "terrestrial, devilish wisdom" (psychic power), man's activities will be selfish, based solely on the exigencies of his physical, hence animal, nature. The above may sound to the average reader as pure nonsense; but every Theosophist must understand when told that there are *Manasic* as well as *Kamic* organs in him, although the cells of his body answer to both physical and spiritual impulses.

---

[4] We fondly trust this very *unscientific* term will throw no "Animalist" into hysterics *beyond* recovery.

Verily that body, so desecrated by Materialism and man himself, is the temple of the Holy Grail, the *Adytum* of the grandest, nay, of all, the mysteries of nature in our solar universe. That body is an Æolian harp, chorded with two sets of strings, one made of pure silver, the other of catgut. When the breath from the divine Fiat brushes softly over the former, man becomes like unto *his* God—but the other set feels it not. It needs the breeze of a strong terrestrial wind, impregnated with animal effluvia, to set its animal chords vibrating. It is the function of the physical, lower mind to act upon the physical organs and their cells; but, it is the higher mind *alone* which can influence the atoms interacting in those cells, which interaction is alone capable of exciting the brain, *viâ the spinal "centre" cord,* to a mental representation of spiritual ideas far beyond any objects on this material plane. The phenomena of divine consciousness have to be regarded as activities of our mind on another and a higher plane, working through something less substantial than the moving molecules of the brain. They cannot be explained as the simple resultant of the cerebral physiological process, as indeed the latter only condition them or give them a final form for purposes of concrete manifestation. Occultism teaches that the liver and the spleen-cells are the most subservient to the action of our "personal" mind, the heart being the organ *par excellence* through which the "Higher" Ego acts—through the Lower Self.

Nor can the visions or memory of purely terrestrial events be transmitted directly through the mental perceptions of the brain—the direct recipient of the impressions of the heart. All such recollections have to be first stimulated by and awakened in the organs which were the originators, as already stated, of the various causes that led to the results, or, the direct recipients and participators of the latter. In other words, if what is called "association of *ideas*" has much to do with the awakening of memory, the mutual interaction and consistent inter-relation between the personal "Mind-Entity" and the organs of the human body have far more so. A hungry stomach evokes the vision of a past banquet, because its action is reflected and repeated in the *personal* mind. But even before the memory of the personal Self radiates the vision from the tablets wherein are stored the experiences of one's daily life—even to the minutest details—the memory of the stomach has already evoked the same. And so with all the organs of the body. It is they which originate according to their animal needs and desires the electro-vital sparks that illuminate the field of consciousness in the

Lower Ego; and it is these sparks which in their turn awaken to function the reminiscences in it. The whole human body is, as said, a vast sounding board, in which each cell bears a long record of impressions connected with its parent organ, and each cell has a memory and a consciousness of its kind, or call it instinct if you will. These impressions are, according to the nature of the organ, physical, psychic, or mental, as they relate to this or another plane. They may be called "states of consciousness" only for the want of a better expression—as there are states of instinctual, mental, and purely abstract, or spiritual consciousness. If we trace all such "psychic" actions to brain-work, it is only because in that mansion called the human body the brain is the front-door, and the only one which opens out into Space. All the others are inner doors, opening in the private building, through which travel incessantly the transmitting agents of memory and sensation. The clearness, the vividness, and intensity of these depend on the state of health and the organic soundness of the transmitters. But their reality, in the sense of trueness or correctness, is due to the "principle" they originate from, and the preponderance in the Lower *Manas* of the *noëtic* or of the *phrenic* ("Kamic," terrestrial) element.

For, as Occultism teaches, if the Higher Mind-Entity—the permanent and the immortal—is of the divine homogeneous essence of "Alaya-Akasa,"[5] or Mahat, — its reflection, the Personal Mind, is, as a temporary "Principle," of the Substance of the Astral Light. As a pure ray of the "Son of the Universal Mind," it could perform no functions in the body, and would remain powerless over the turbulent organs of Matter. Thus, while its inner constitution is Manasic, its "body," or rather functioning essence, is heterogeneous, and leavened with the Astral Light, the lowest element of Ether. It is a part of the mission of the Manasic Ray, to get gradually rid of the blind, deceptive element which, though it makes of it an active spiritual entity on this plane, still brings it into so close contact with matter as to entirely becloud its divine nature and stultify its intuitions.

This leads us to see the difference between the pure noëtic and the terrestrial psychic visions of seership and mediumship. The former can be obtained by one of two means; (*a*) on the condition of paralyzing at will the *memory* and the instinctual, independent action of all the material organs and even cells in the body of flesh, an act which, once that the light of the Higher Ego has consumed

[5] Another name for the universal mind.

and subjected for ever the passional nature of the personal, lower Ego, is easy, but requires an adept; and (*b*) of being a reincarnation of one, who, in a previous birth, had attained through extreme purity of life and efforts in the right direction almost to a *Yogi*-state of holiness and saintship. There is also a third possibility of reaching in mystic visions the plane of the higher Manas; but it is only occasional and does not depend on the will of the Seer, but on the extreme weakness and exhaustion of the material body through illness and suffering. The Seeress of Prevorst was an instance of the latter case; and Jacob Boëhme of our second category. In all other cases of abnormal seership, of so-called clairaudience, clairvoyance and trances, it is simply—*mediumship*.

Now what is a medium? The term medium, when not applied simply to things and objects, is supposed to be a person through whom the action of another person or being is either manifested or transmitted. Spiritualists believing in communications with disembodied spirits, and that these can manifest through, or impress sensitives to transmit "messages" from them, regard mediumship as a blessing and a great privilege. We Theosophists, on the other hand, who do not believe in the "communion of spirits" as Spiritualists do, regard the gift as one of the most dangerous of abnormal nervous diseases. A medium is simply one in whose personal Ego, or terrestrial mind, (*psuche*), the percentage of "astral" light so preponderates as to impregnate with it their whole physical constitution. Every organ and cell thereby is attuned, so to speak, and subjected to an enormous and abnormal tension. The mind is ever on the plane of, and quite immersed in, that deceptive light whose *soul* is divine, but whose body—the light waves on the lower planes, infernal; for they are but the black and disfigured reflections of the earth's memories. The untrained eye of the poor sensitive cannot pierce the dark mist, the dense fog of the terrestrial emanations, to see beyond in the radiant field of the eternal truths. His vision is out of focus. His senses, accustomed from his birth, like those of a native of the London slums, to stench and filth, to the unnatural distortions of sights and images tossed on the kaleidoscopic waves of the astral plane—are unable to discern the true from the false. And thus, the pale soulless corpses moving in the trackless fields of "Kama loka," appear to him the living images of the "dear departed" ones; the broken echoes of once human voices, passing through his mind, suggest to him well co-ordinated phrases, which he repeats, in ignorance that their final form and polish were received in the innermost depths of his own brain-factory. And hence

the sight and the hearing of that which if seen in its true nature would have struck the medium's heart cold with horror, now fills him with a sense of beatitude and confidence. He really believes that the immeasurable vistas displayed before him are the real spiritual world, the abode of the blessed disembodied angels.

We describe the broad main features and facts of mediumship, there being no room in such an article for exceptional cases. We maintain — having unfortunately passed at one period of life *personally* through such experiences — that on the whole, mediumship is most dangerous; and *psychic* experiences when accepted indiscriminately lead only to honestly deceiving others, because the medium is the first self-deceived victim. Moreover, a too close association with the "Old Terrestrial Serpent" is infectious. The odic and magnetic currents of the Astral Light often incite to murder, drunkenness, immorality, and, as Eliphas Lévi expresses it, the not altogether pure natures "can be driven headlong by the blind forces set in motion in the *Light*"—by the errors and sins imposed on its waves.

And this is how the great Mage of the XIXth century corroborates the foregoing when speaking of the Astral Light:

> "We have said that to acquire magical power, two things are necessary: to disengage the will from all servitude, and to exercise it in control. . .
>
> "The sovereign will (of the adept) is represented in our symbols by the woman who crushes the serpent's head, and by the resplendent angel who represses the dragon, and holds him under his foot and spear; the great magical agent, the dual current of light, the living and astral *fire* of the earth, has been represented in the ancient theogonies by the serpent with the head of a bull, a ram, or a dog. It is the double serpent of the *caduceus*, it is the Old Serpent of *Genesis*, but it is also the *brazen serpent of Moses* entwined around the *tau*, that is to say, the generative *lingha*. It is also the goat of the witch-sabbath, and the Baphomet of the Templars; it is the *Hylé* of the Gnostics; it is the double-tailed serpent which forms the legs of the solar cock of the Abraxas: finally, it is the Devil of M. Eudes de Mirville. But in very fact it is the blind force which souls (*i.e.*, the lower *Manas* or Nephesh) have to conquer to liberate themselves from the bonds of the earth; for if their will does not free 'them from this *fatal attraction*, they will be absorbed in the current by the force which has produced them, and *will return to the central and eternal fire*'."[6]

---

[6] "Dogme et Rituel de la Haute Magie," quoted in "Isis Unveiled."

The "central and eternal fire" is that disintegrating Force, that gradually consumes and burns out the *Kama-rupa,* or "personality," in the Kama-loka, whither it goes after death. And verily, the Mediums are attracted by the astral light, it is the direct cause of their personal "souls" being absorbed "by the force which has produced" their terrestrial elements. And, therefore, as the same Occultist tells us:

> "All the magical operations consist in *freeing* one's self from the coils of the Ancient Serpent; then to place the foot on its head, and lead it according to the operator's will. 'I will give unto thee,' says the Serpent, in the Gospel myth, 'all the kingdoms of the earth, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.' The initiated should reply to him, 'I will not fall down, but thou shalt crouch at my feet; thou wilt give me nothing, but I will make use of thee and take whatever I wish. For *I am thy Lord and Master!*'"

And as such, the *Personal Ego,* becoming at one with its divine parent, shares in the immortality of the latter. Otherwise. . . .

Enough, however. Blessed is he who has acquainted himself with the dual powers at work in the ASTRAL Light; thrice blessed he who has learned to discern the *Noëtic* from the *Psychic* action of the "Double-Faced" God in him, and who knows the potency of his own Spirit—or "Soul Dynamics."

"UNCONSCIOUS OCCULTISM"

"I am persuaded that we are all surrounded by an atmosphere—a separate, sensitive, distinct envelope extending some distance from our visible persons—and whenever my invisible atmosphere is invaded, it affects my whole nervous system. The proximity of any *bodies* but those I love best is unendurable to my body."

"Place, time, life, death, earth, heaven, are divisions and distinctions we make, like the imaginary lines we trace upon the surface of the globe. . . . Your theory of partial immortality is abhorrent to me. I would rather disbelieve in the immortality of my own soul than suppose the boon given to me was withheld from any of my fellow creatures." —FANNY KEMBLE.

MAN THE KNOWER

IN every man is the sense of the unknown as well as of the known. Sense, in some definition of the term, is characteristic of every kingdom and of all Nature, but it is needful to bear in mind that definitions are made by man to describe *his* experience and observation, whether of self or of nature. Human experience seems to each individual to be unique to himself, but contact and communication make certain that what appears peculiar to each is actually common to all because accessible to all. What is already recognized as common to mankind is defined as "Human nature."

Pursuing the analogy, the like community of perception may be seen to reign throughout the whole of nature. The animals possess the same physical senses as man, but use them according to their own nature, and communicate in ways unknown as well as known to mankind. The same may be said of the vegetable world, of the mineral kingdom, of the chemical elements, of the forces of nature. Each of these, whether as collectivity or as individual, has something in common with all others, as well as that which is peculiar or unique. From this it is evident that despite all perceptible differences, there is that which permeates the whole of great Nature, which is common to every nature, which maintains the poise or balance in the whole and in the parts.

No greater error, then, could there be than to deal with self or with one's fellow men, or indeed with anything soever, on any other basis than that of the community of all in Nature. When we speak of "the failures of Nature" we are but using the same symbolism that we employ in speaking of the sun's rising and setting—with this difference, that in the latter instance we know better, and deceive neither ourselves nor others by the terms used. But with less understanding we speak of creation and destruction, birth and death, success and failure, good and evil. Actually, the sum-total of human knowledge of "the problems of existence" has no more validity than the naïve sense-impressions of a child or a savage. To the child, the rising and setting of the sun is simply an observed appearance. The sense-fact is there, the sense-knowledge is there, but the belief that the sun rises is a product of ignorance, not of understanding. The phenomenon of sunrise and sunset gives rise to another, that of day and night. A relation which we call cause and effect is quickly perceived by the eye of reason, and each phenomenon is rationally or logically accounted for in terms of the other. And so on, through all the phenomena experienced sentiently

and mentally, or objectively and subjectively, during earthly or human existence. We explain one experience by another, relate one to another, and others, and then die, as we were born—in ignorance of what lies behind all phenomena, of the Why and Wherefore of anything and everything.

To deny or ignore purposiveness in Nature, and equally to attempt to understand or explain that purposiveness in partial terms, is to stultify the mind. The principle of reason arises not only from the perception of differences, but also from the perception of that community between subject and object, between cause and effect, without which the principle of reason is latent, non-existent in fact; but which, since it is actually existent in every man, cannot be explained in terms of reason alone, in terms of human experience, of "facts" alone. There is no "reason" that we know of for the reign of law any more than for the reign of chance; no "reason" for the operation of what we have called cause and effect any more than for the operating of what we name a miracle. Reason, we forget or fail to observe, can be employed to lead to false conclusions quite as facilely as to solve a problem correctly.

The fault lies, not in the principle of reason itself, but in the use made of that principle by mankind. As well ascribe the physical ills of mankind to the senses, as to allocate their psychic counterparts to the reason or mind. Man acts in a given way which brings good or evil, or perhaps both good and evil, relations or results, but in any case his reason and his reasoning are an element throughout. In the vast majority of cases his reason is employed to explain his own personal success or failure: he uses this principle from an exclusive basis or point of view. What is this but to employ his mind, not as a bridge between the known and the unknown, but to widen and deepen the gulf between the two facets or aspects of his own being? Neither what is wholly known, nor what is wholly unknown, is subject to reason. If we *know* any fact, it is, as fact, beyond reason, as is also anything we do not know.

"What is to be understood by the mind is that there is no separateness at all." This oft-quoted aphorism from the oldest *Upanishads* embodies the primeval and unchanging Eternal Verity in nature as in man, in man as in nature. *Manas* is translated and understood as "mind," but Manas means far more than that word conveys to the average man. It means the Thinker as well as his thoughts, the Knower as well as his knowledge. Human Nature is a compound of knowledge and ignorance. Divinity is "the conquest of ignorance by the revelation of secret, *spiritual* knowledge."

From earliest childhood until death every man is engaged, consciously or unconsciously, in the pursuit of practical occultism—the endeavor to probe the secrets of nature. Whatever may be the subject or object engaging our attention, we instinctively endeavor to relate it to the environment of thought and action we call the present. More this is done, more we are inspired or impelled to relate the present to the past, to relate the past and the present to the future. All this is practical occultism, however many the failures or mistakes.

All religions may be justly said to represent one method of dealing with the occult in nature and in man; modern science in all its branches represents another. Religion and Science represent, in respect to each other, not belligerents engaged in a life-and-death struggle for supremacy, but rather two parties with the same objective—the understanding of the Government of nature and of man. Now the one triumphs, now the other, the victory of the one spelling the defeat of the other in cyclic alternation. Both being human, the real problem is seldom faced, let alone considered: that Nature overthrows *both* in order to preserve equilibrium. Human science, human religion, are but playing at blind-man's bluff until man the Knower recognizes that Nature is *self*-governing. Why this blindness on the part of both science and religion as personified in their exponents and devotees? Because, to borrow again from the Upanishads, "neither of them understands."

Man, the human being, stands between the Spiritual and the Material poles or aspects of manifested and manifesting nature or life, between "the upper and the nether millstones." The principle of reason, or the mind of man, derives from this fact. From Spirit comes its reflection or light, and from the other pole, Matter, *its* light or reflection. That which is light to Spirit is darkness to Matter, and vice versa. Their coadunition in man is human self-consciousness—the sense of identity. The fundamental Unity of both higher and lower nature is evidenced by the fact that the self-consciousness of man cannot stand alone, isolated, *separate*. The Thinker identifies self, now with one pole of Being, now with the other, so long as he *reasons* on the diverse presentments of his own existence. He has to rise above reason or sink below it, to lose all consciousness of self, or to *realize* that his identity depends on Unity, not on Separateness, on harmony, not on discord. How else could the Knower of the mortal become also the Knower of the Eternal SELF?

YOUTH-COMPANIONS' FORUM

IN *destroying insects are we doing wrong, or do we release them to higher forms?*

There are many animal pests, including insects, which man considers undesirable, and he will use any means to effect their extermination. But how often has such destruction been the means for other pests, even less desirable, to flourish? We say that certain animals must be "controlled" so that man may survive. That this is not always true, at least in regard to pests of agriculture, is shown by experiments carried on by both the Department of Agriculture and by individual enterprise. It has been found that plants grown in soil containing all the essential elements are better able to resist both diseases and pests. Were we to fertilize the fields of our own natures with brotherly feelings toward all life, we would find far less necessity for destroying animal forms. Destructive pests are simply the reflection of human thought and action; we are responsible for all the lower kingdoms, insofar as they affect us.

It is said that men appear as "gods" to the animals, but how ruthless is man's behavior toward these younger brothers! This is because we fail to recognize the Oneness of Life, of which all forms are expressions. Man has no right of life and death over the animals lower than himself in the scale of nature. According to H. P. B.: "Besides being endowed with a soul—of which every animal, and even plant, is more or less possessed—man has his immortal *rational* soul, or *nous,* which ought to make him at least equal in magnanimity to the elephant, who treads so carefully, lest he should crush weaker creatures than himself." (*Isis Unveiled* II, 279.)

But what should one do when poisonous spiders or destructive ants invade our homes? Are we to let them run rampant? There are times when destruction seems to be a necessity. Then there are the millions of tiny creatures in the air we breathe and the water we drink. All these are a necessary sacrifice to our embodied existence. But as Mr. Judge once wrote, "It becomes a wrong when we deliberately without actual need destroy the lives of animals or insects." (THEOSOPHY III, 243.) Again:

> What happens when, with intention, you crush out the life of a common croton bug? Well, it is destroyed and you forget it. But you brought it to an untimely end, short though its life would have been. Imagine this being done at hundreds of thousands of places

> in the State. Each of these little creatures had life and energy; each some degree of intelligence. The sum total of the effects of all these deaths of small things must be appreciable. If not, then our doctrines are wrong and there is no wrong in putting out the life of a human being . . . what is the difference between wantonly killing a deer and murdering an idiot? Very little to my mind. (THEOSOPHY I, 147-8.)

What is the difference between killing a deer and killing an insect? In principle there is none, except as motive makes a difference. In *The Secret Doctrine,* H. P. B. says that the animal "Monad does not reincarnate in the same, but in a higher species." (II, 196fn.) What happens when we cut off animal intelligence from its full experience in a given species? The teaching is that the animal Monad in each species must learn all that is to be learned there before passing to a higher form. (THEOSOPHY II, 444.) Obviously, human destruction of an animal form of life gives no progress, but is rather a hindrance.

The only way we can really eliminate "undesirable pests" is by eliminating from our own natures the causes which create an affinity for them. This will at the same time assist those lives in their evolution and raise them to forms which have a beneficial relation to the human kingdom. This is working *with* Nature, and striving for the redemption of every living creature.

The present educational systems are based largely on the use of examinations. What is wrong with this basis?

(*a*) Behind every superstition and false practice there is some law of nature which has been misunderstood. This is true of examinations. Each period of evolution begins and ends with a review, as does every subdivision, the major and minor yugas. The death review of a human being and his little daily review come under this universal tendency or principle of review. The examinations of today grow out of the general principle and are wrong only in the misapplication of the idea. The English educator, Edmond Holmes, in *What Is and What Might Be* defined the typical examination as

> . . . a periodic test which is designed to measure, not the degree of growth which the child has made, but the industry of the teacher as indicated by the receptivity of his class.
>
> The truth is that inward and spiritual growth, even if it were thought desirable to produce it and measure it, could not possibly be measured. The real "results" of education are in the child's heart and mind and soul, beyond the reach of any measuring tape or weighing machine.

The value of the examination discipline is overlooked when undue

importance is given to the formal examination. Since the less important aspects of the student's development—memory work and factual information—receive special attention in the written test, education tends to lose sight of its true purpose—the stimulation of the creative faculties. Too much emphasis on memory leads to an over-development of the lower mind, shutting the door to the inspiration of higher manas.

The young theosophist, knowing the value of examination as a review, tries to work in and through the system, however defective, and by his right attitude to benefit himself as well as help the race to overcome the bad system. By keeping up with his work he would always be prepared for any test without need of cramming.

The best examination is self-examination. In true education, examinations would incline to questions of a searching and fundamental character, putting the emphasis on knowledge rather than on information. Writing on education in the *Key,* H. P. B. said: "We would reduce the purely mechanical work of the memory to an absolute minimum, and devote the time to the development and training of the inner senses, faculties and latent capacities." Who can examine the inner man? Surely none but the adept could test advancement on inner planes. Proper and truly theosophical education would "deal with each child as a unit, . . . educate it so as to produce the most harmonious and equal unfoldment of its powers, . . . aim at creating *free* men and women, free intellectually, free morally, unprejudiced in all respects, and above all things, *unselfish.*"

(*b*) The idea of examinations is a very ancient one. The pupil, in order to ascertain what he knows, meets a test. This may consist in performing some duty or in solving a problem. The student undertakes this discipline to prove the development of his moral or mental nature. The one who benefits is obviously the pupil, but it is often necessary for the teacher to know how the pupil is progressing; hence, the examination, through which the teacher learns what and how to teach the pupil. But whatever part the teacher may play, the true examination is in the resulting self-analysis on the part of the pupil, who is helped to see his deficiencies so that he may resolve to correct them.

The perversions of the ancient system are all too evident today. The vast majority of pupils in our schools and colleges regard examinations as an end instead of a means. As a result, students strive primarily for marks, or to "pass." The ancient idea of learning so that one may be the better able to help others has disap-

peared. Perhaps this induced selfishness is the greatest evil introduced by the examination system.

Most modern examinations test only the intellect, neglecting the power to attack and solve a problem. Memory plays too large a part in education, with the result that the student learns a mass of facts but cannot meet the ordinary problems of life successfully. Examinations are a result rather than a cause of present troubles; human selfishness is the real cause, and until this is eliminated we will be subject to the results of poor education. A true student who finds himself in the present educational system does not look for results. He takes his examinations, poor though they may be, as a necessary part of his training, but does not attach his hopes to the results. Such an attitude spreads good effects; the example travels and difficulties are lightened for students. By assuming an impersonal attitude, students can assist educators who are trying to introduce reforms.

A GREAT TEACHER

Of the great educators of antiquity, I esteem Pythagoras the most eminent and successful; everything of his doctrine and discipline comes commended by its elegance and humanity, and justifies the name he bore of the golden-souled Samian, and founder of Greek culture. He seems to have stood in providential nearness to human sensibility, as if his were a maternal relation as well, and he owned the minds whom he nurtured and educated. The first of philosophers, taking the name for its modesty of pretension, he justified his claim to it in the attainments and services of his followers; his school having given us Socrates, Plato, Pericles, Plutarch, Plotinus, and others of almost equal fame, founders of states and cultures. . . . He was reverenced by the multitude as one under the influence of divine inspiration. He abstained from all intoxicating drinks, and from animal food, confining himself to a chaste nutriment; hence his sleep was short and undisturbed; his soul vigilant and pure; his body in a state of perfect and invariable health. He was free from the superstitions of his time, and pervaded with a deep sense of duty toward God, and veneration for his divine attributes and immanency in things. He fixed his mind so intently on the attainment of wisdom, that systems and mysteries inaccessible to others were opened to him by his magic genius and sincerity of purpose.

—BRONSON ALCOTT.

IN SEARCH OF TRUTH

AMONG philosophers have been many whose quest for truth has led them to see that no two men interpret what they feel, hear, or experience, in exactly the same way. Thus the complete relativity of truth appears to be an obvious conclusion. Yet is it not equally clear that within each one is the power to perceive relative values? The *ability* to weigh various supposed "truths," to form a conclusion as to the relativity of all our present knowledge, is itself a constant and eternal factor, else we would have no basis for evaluation and judgment. Man, through all his changing experience, has that within him which is constant, for the changing cannot perceive change; one must "look down" on change from another plane of being in order to recognize it *as change*. The very philosophers who deplore the mention of "absolutes" forget that the acceptance of "relativity" depends on something "absolute" within them; if they are to perceive the fact of relativity, there must be a place of unalterable constancy amidst all this ceaseless flux.

How comes the unchanging to support knowledge of the world of change? Why should there be a reality independent of forms and ideas? To say that nothing is *absolutely* true in our world of physical perceptions is correct; but one who assumes that this relativistic world is the only one he lives in, or that he is capable of living in, should take into account his own experience. How did he learn that truth is "relative"? How did he discover that the "truths" of another are not necessarily false because opposed to his own ideas? To see that truths are relative, it was first necessary for him to gain a larger perspective, to remove himself from the world of his own thoughts long enough to understand with sympathy the basis of other views. Such a transition is rightly conceived as progress, for the mind-world of tolerance and sympathetic understanding is superior to the mind-world of dogma and bigotry. Those who have achieved this transition should reflect on the *nature of the process* that made such a change in their mind-world possible. So long as they existed in the enclosed sphere of their own ideas, it was impossible to consider any other world as real. For Galileo to perceive that the earth moves around the sun, he had first to assume mentally a position contradicted by the testimony of his physical senses. In idea, he looked upon the moving earth as if he were on a motionless sun, with the result that he saw all the heavens

in a different relationship. Thus, just so long as men consider physical existence as the only *real* form of existence, just so long will they be intolerant of suggestions that there is another kind of world —a world where values are not subject to the evanescent fluctuations of "truths" on the plane of form and matter.

Impermanence and mutability are ever characteristic of form. Destruction and regeneration are the two processes by which a constant transformation takes place, providing for the reincarnation of intelligent lives which pass through forms. True values do not exist in change; the values and moralities prized by each civilization are but the reflection, more or less distorted, of perceptions which have filtered into earthly consciousness from higher planes of being.

How can we be sure that there are "higher planes of being"? All the reasoning in seven worlds may not be convincing, but let us begin to analyze our own nature and our quest may be instantly rewarded. What is the most essential part of a human being, or, for that matter, of any being? It is the power to unfold, to grow, to realize the potentiality resident within. Let us call that power Spirit—the highest in all beings and in all beings the same. This primal reality can be realized by each one within himself. It is a perception which cannot be distorted by the world of matter, for it is never seen except by spirit.

Of what use is the knowledge of such a reality? we may ask. What does it tell us of the truth or falsity bound up in the claims of individuals or philosophies? To realize the spirit within as our highest and essential nature is but the first step—the starting point for all our inquiries into relationships among beings. To realize that all beings of whatever degree are on the same path as ourselves is then the second step, and by this also we are able to appreciate more fully that the spiritual nature is of *one principle*. All beings, therefore, exist in a state of unity on the highest plane.

By means of other principles we contact other planes of consciousness. Working on and through these planes is our method of gaining universal experience—universal because on every plane. Through the intuitional plane, through the mind plane, through the emotional plane, incessant interaction takes place among all the intelligences sharing those states of consciousness. By participating in the experiences of these planes through the corresponding principles within ourselves, we are able to manifest more fully our spiritual powers. When we exchange the limitations of a single perspective for a universal view, we have learned *from the inter-*

action experienced the interdependence of all beings. If we acquire this knowledge, the most fundamental in the school of life, we act not for self but for all selves. We understand the significance of "right motive," which, in reality, depends upon the knowledge of our true nature.

When faced with the problem of discerning the right course of conduct, which is the search for practical rather than theoretical truth, we need light from the plane of spirit to illumine the relationships of beings and things involved. We need to understand the nature of the planes of consciousness through which we must act, by means of the corresponding principle within ourselves. We can also judge from the basis of *truth* whether the choices and actions of others arise from a like perspective, or from a distorted picture caused by absorption in one plane to the exclusion of all others. Such a perception never leads to condemnation of another's choice, but rather to an understanding of its basis, whether true or only partial. Only through understanding can our fellows be helped, if they will, to gain a higher perspective.

Not until we have finished with all need of experience on the present plane of being will our own perspective become all-inclusive and crystal clear. Yet even now we can know one "absolute truth" —that through constant effort, we may approach ever nearer to Reality. Such perception becomes an "eternal value," not only to ourselves, but to all others on the path of evolution.

Thoughts in Solitude

The universe is not dead. Therefore, there is an Intelligence there, and it is all pervading. At least one purpose, possibly the major purpose of that Intelligence is the achievement of universal harmony.

Striving in the right direction for peace (Harmony), therefore, as well as the achievement of it, is the result of accord with that Intelligence.

It is desirable to effect that accord.

The human race, then, is not alone in the universe. Though I am cut off from human beings, I am not alone.

For untold ages man has felt an awareness of that Intelligence. Belief in it is the one point where all religions agree. It has been called by many names. Many call it God.

—*Alone,* by Richard E. Byrd.

WHY EVOLUTION?

A PERENNIAL question skeptical newcomers to Theosophy take great satisfaction in posing, and one which puzzles earnest inquirers and students, may be phrased thus: If the Ego has perfect knowledge on his own plane, how can Theosophy teach that the purpose of evolution is to learn? What need is there for evolution? The same question is raised in relation to a more circumscribed cycle, in this form: If men lived wisely and as brothers in the Golden Age, why do they have to undergo the misery of Kali Yuga?

The customary answer to these questions, that the Ego must learn to bring through the knowledge which is his on higher planes —and which he had in the Golden Age—into present daily life, may appear an insufficient reason to some, but if care is taken to realize its full implications, the apparent contradiction can be resolved. It will be necessary, however, to give up long-established habits of thought, which almost invariably materialize the subtle conceptions of occult philosophy. This subject, H. P. B., says, is "the most difficult to explain in all it details and bearings; since the whole mystery of evolutionary creation is contained in it." Some *Secret Doctrine* statements should form the foundation for such an inquiry. First, then,

> The Doctrine teaches that, in order to become a divine, fully conscious god, — aye, even the highest — the Spiritual primeval INTELLIGENCES must pass through the human stage. . . . Each Entity must have won for itself the right of becoming divine, through self-experience. Hegel, the great German thinker, must have known or sensed intuitionally this truth when saying, as he did, that the Unconscious evolved the Universe only "in the hope of attaining clear self-consciousness," of becoming, in other words, MAN; for this is also the secret meaning of the usual Purânic phrase about Brahmâ being constantly "moved by the desire to create." (*S. D.* I, 106-7.)

While the condition of those beings destined to become a struggling and suffering humanity was undeniably *spiritual*, prior to manifestation, "to become a *Self-Conscious* Spirit, the latter must pass through every cycle of being, culminating in its highest point on earth in Man."

> Spirit *per se* is an unconscious negative ABSTRACTION. Its purity is inherent, not acquired by merit; hence, as already shown, to become the highest Dhyan Chohan it is necessary for each Ego to attain

> to full self-consciousness as a human, *i.e.,* conscious being, which is synthesized for us in Man. (*S. D.* I, 193.)
>
> No Entity, whether angelic or human, can reach the state of Nirvana, or of absolute purity, except through æons of suffering and the knowledge of EVIL as well as of good, as otherwise the latter remains incomprehensible. (II, 81.)

Obviously, the problem hinges on what is meant by the statement that the Ego has perfect knowledge on his own plane. It is clear that a purely homogeneous state of *spirit,* however "perfect," is entirely passive, with respect to the beings absorbed in it. The incarnating *Manasa Putra* broke from this static condition in order to increase their self-knowledge; they were "entities seeking to become still more conscious by uniting with more developed matter." (II, 167.) "It is owing to this rebellion of intellectual life against the morbid inactivity of pure spirit, that we are what we are —self-conscious, thinking men, with the capabilities and attributes of Gods in us, for good as much as for evil." (II, 103). Thus the *spirituality* of potential men on the highest planes is self-conscious only insofar as that self-consciousness has been *won* in weary pilgrimages to man-bearing worlds.

The work of evolution, then, is to bring the Ego to that state of spiritual independence by which the knowledge which is his on the highest plane remains undiminished when he is active on the most differentiated spheres of separateness. Life in a body is the life of spirit on trial.

Let us take some illustrations. If, for example, a man were to spend many years in a strange land, under the most favorable conditions, would his loyalty to the land of his birth remain unshaken? How strong is the brotherhood of one who finds himself in a veritable chaos of warring parties; will he still be convinced that the One Self is in all? Consider a child surrounded by parents, teachers and companions who teach and exemplify the loftiest virtues and the profoundest wisdom. He experiences nothing but the true; the shadow of falsehood or selfishness has never darkened his life. But grown to manhood, seeing on every hand selfishness, hatred and cunning, will he still remain free from the heresy of separateness? If he finds that by living life squarely and honestly on principles, he earns only reviling and persecution from his fellows, will he still act as brother to all that live? These are grave questions.

Not until he has been through every trial, in every state of matter and condition, and has maintained throughout his faith in what he believes to be true, does a man really *embody* the truth.

Looked at from this point of view, evolution is seen to be a great period of probation, wherein each one has to prove his right to the *conscious* realization of truth, to conscious immortality. And the goal of any period of evolution may be said to be attained when the Real Man can pass unscathed through the fire of every temptation, and his spiritual equilibrium is undisturbed by any shock.

These are truly the tests that try men's souls. The real victories of life go to the strong—those staunch of soul who, scorning hypocrisy, practice what they preach; who consider that if a doctrine is true and good enough to adopt, it is good enough to act upon at all times. The purpose of evolution *is* to learn—to learn never to forget the truth all men possess innately. So long as men forget, they do not really know, and must go through the school of further evolution.

"ELECT" OF MANKIND

"Divine science" does not mean a revelation from an anthropomorphic god on a mount amidst thunder and lightning; but, as we understand it, a language and a system imparted to the early mankind by a more advanced *mankind,* so much higher as to be *divine* in the sight of that infant humanity. By a "mankind," in short, from other spheres; an idea which contains nothing supernatural in it, but the acceptance or rejection of which depends upon the degree of conceit and arrogance in the mind of him to whom it is stated. For, if the professors of modern knowledge would only confess that, though they know nothing of the future of the disembodied man—or rather will accept nothing—yet this future may be pregnant with surprises and unexpected revelations to them, once their Egos are rid of their gross bodies—then materialistic unbelief would have fewer chances than it has. Who of them knows, or can tell, what may happen when once the life cycle of this globe is run down and our mother earth herself falls into her last sleep? Who is bold enough to say that the *divine* Egos of our mankind—at least the elect out of the multitudes passing on to other spheres—*will* not become in their turn the "divine" instructors of a new mankind generated by them on a new globe, called to life and activity by the disembodied "principles" of our Earth?—*The Secret Doctrine.*

ON THE LOOKOUT

"Forgotten Experiments"

Of special interest to Theosophical students is the department, "Forgotten Experiments," currently appearing in the popular monthly, *Coronet*. R. DeWitt Miller, who edits the department, inclines toward reviving public interest in scientific findings which run counter to the materialistic assumptions of modern biology and psychology—an activity of which theosophists thoroughly approve. Among forgotten experiments reported in *Coronet* for October, 1939, were the following: William McDougall's measurement in 1906 of the small loss of weight of the human body at the moment of death—yet to be verified by other investigators; the demonstration by Hereward Carrington in 1921 that the human will can exert a physical force—never disproved; the photographing in 1918 of strange rays which emanate from the human body, by Dr. Frederick Finch Strong, practicing physician of Hollywood, Calif., and finally, the discovery reported in 1924 by Alexander Gurwitsch, Moscow horticulturist, that plant roots give forth radiations from their tips, which radiation is connected with growth. Gurwitsch's findings, says Mr. Miller, were checked in Paris by J. and M. Mangrou, who obtained the same results.

Is Blood "Psychic"?

The November, 1939, *Coronet* contains an account of what the department editor calls the "strangest experiment in telepathy," carried out by a professional blood donor in 1925:

> "The next time one of the people to whom I have given blood dies, I will make an experiment—then I will know."
>
> So spoke Frederick George Lee, regular blood donor of the Middlesex Hospital, London, who believed he felt pain in his arm each time a person to whom he had given blood died.
>
> When next he felt such a pain, he carefully noted the time. It was the exact instant when the person to whom he had last given blood had died.
>
> Seven out of twenty-four recipients of his blood died, and seven times he received the strange telepathic message from his blood. Doctors at the hospital could not shake Lee's conclusions.

While the Bible, that "esoterically wise and exoterically foolish" book, is hardly an authority for the practitioners of modern medicine, the skeptical physicians who "could not shake Lee's conclu-

sions" would nevertheless find in *Leviticus* a clue to the meaning of the donor's experience. In chapter 17 Moses is instructed: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood. . . . No soul of you shall eat blood. . . . For it is the life of all flesh: the blood of it is for the life thereof. . . . " This statement H. P. B. explains as an echo from the sanctuaries of the initiated hierophants. The blood itself, she says, "is one of the innumerable states of that Spirit of the *One Life* of Esotericism: Ether, vapor, ozone, animal electricity, etc., and finally animal blood." (*Theosophist* V, 82 fn.) Blood, as the vital fluid of the body, would naturally establish a sympathetic relation between the recipient and the donor in a transfusion, which accounts for the pain felt by Lee: *some of his blood had died!*

"MUMIA" OF PARACELSUS

The blood has been suggestively defined as "the four lower principles in solution"; for Paracelsus, the blood was a carrier of the *mumia,* the "life principle" or vital essence of the animal organism. Doubtless the Mosaic prohibition against the consumption of blood has its foundation in the occult law stated by Paracelsus, that the "mumia of a living being partakes of the characteristics of the being from which it is taken," for which reason men do not eat ferocious animals such as tigers, lions, etc., whose mumias are "fiery" and would cause similar tendencies to develop in human beings. (It has been observed by some that the characteristic effluvia of fresh meat is lacking in dried or smoked meats, which is perhaps due to elimination of the mumia through the curing process.) Transfusion renders the recipient defenseless against the psychic constituents of blood directly introduced into his veins.

CONTAGIONS—KNOWN AND UNKNOWN

Whereas in ancient times, the vital fluid would have been imparted by a magnetic healer, one of psychic as well as physical purity, today we have only the crude and mechanical reflection of this secret in blood transfusion. It is not difficult to see the connection between this widely practiced technique of modern medicine and certain employments of the blood in the sorcerer's art, as described by Paracelsus. Even if the motives of all involved are of the best, who can tell whether the donor's blood may be the carrier of some subtle psychic infection? This is a penalty of ignorance. Two years ago a hospital in New York was sued for $75,000 damages by a woman who claimed that she contracted syphilis from donors who had not been given Wasserman tests. What of the

psychic quality of syphilitic blood? What unknown affinities may be contained in any blood that passes all merely physical tests?

Types of Blood

In 1930, Dr. Karl Landsteiner of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research received the Nobel prize in medicine for his discovery that human blood is of four different types, and that blood of one type does not always mix with blood of another type. (*Science*, Nov. 7, 1930.) The transfusion of the blood of one type into the veins of a person whose blood belongs to another group may cause the latter's blood cells to agglutinate, or "clump" together, a result often fatal to the patient. The classification of blood into four groups is based on the presence or absence of two substances which are found to be hereditary. One type of individual has blood containing substance A; a second type has substance B; a third type has neither A nor B (called type O); and a fourth, which is comparatively rare, has both A and B (type AB). Additional studies by Dr. Landsteiner revealing three new agglutinable factors led to further divisions within the basic four groups, so that "it could be established that there are at least 36 different types of human blood, if one takes into account the subdivisions of groups A and AB each into two subgroups." (*Science*, April 17, 1931.) He observes:

> On the basis of these results we may assert that in the case of man there are numerous individual blood differences already demonstrated, and undoubtedly there exist others which have not yet been established. Whether actually each individual blood possesses a special quality, or how frequently there is complete correspondence with the blood of others, can not be definitely stated at present.

"Shock" of Transfusion

Transfusions performed in accord with blood groups have reduced mortality to about one or two per thousand. Dr. Landsteiner reports one case of pernicious anemia in which the patient during a period of three and a half years received 87 transfusions "without any serious consequences." He admits, however, that there are, "in addition to slight disturbances, exceptionally severe and even fatal accidents which may not be attributable to errors in technique." And while the classification of bloods in four general groups has helped to explain the phenomenon of agglutination, "the pathogenesis of shock following transfusion has, however, not yet been

fully explained." The degree to which such "shock" might be attributed to the psychic essence of the transfused blood—the *mumia* of Paracelsus—is of course a question which remains unrecognized in the forum of modern medical theory. There are those who would prefer to die a "natural" death, however premature, to obtaining a life artificially prolonged by the psychic vitality of others, vampirized from their veins by modern medical art. Life at the price of accepting the alien essences and psychic residues of another's blood, his animal magnetism in fluid form, is a life that is undesirable, they would say. Better to accept the Karma of a shorter life, and look forward to a new birth uncomplicated by blindly crossed lines of psychic and physical heredity.

Of incidental interest in connection with Dr. Landsteiner's research is the fact that since his primary discovery of blood groups, anthropologists have piled up an enormous literature on the subject in an endeavor to correlate blood with race. He summarizes the remarkable finding of L. and H. Hirszfeld, that "there exist characteristic differences among the various races." The A type of blood predominates among North Europeans, and B among a number of Asiatic races. American Indians of pure blood belong almost exclusively to the O group. (See THEOSOPHY XV, 383.)

LINCOLN—CHILD OF HEREDITY AND ENVIRONMENT?

The Saturday Evening Post for Feb. 17 celebrated Lincoln's birthday with an editorial comparison of Lincoln with his stepbrother, John D. Johnston. Two letters from Lincoln to Johnston are printed, both showing the great president's profound understanding of human nature, his desire to be of assistance to his amiable but shiftless relative, although he was unwilling to help Johnston with money at the cost of the latter's character. It is plain that Lincoln did everything in his power to get Johnston to stand on his own feet. Johnston, according to Ward Lamon, "had no positive vice except idleness, and no special virtue except good temper. He was . . . always needy and always clamoring for the aid of his friends." The editorial repeats what Sarah Lincoln, Abraham's stepmother, said to Herndon about Lincoln's character; then, in conclusion, the *Post* writer asks some questions that believers in Reincarnation as well as Republican critics of Communism will regard as specially pertinent:

> "Abe was a good boy," she told him. "I can say what scarcely one woman, a mother, can say in a thousand; it is this:

Abe never gave me a cross word or look and never refused in fact, or even in appearance, to do anything I asked." As Herndon left, she wept and said: "Goodbye, my good son's friend, farewell."

Environment or heredity? If Thomas Lincoln was, in fact, the father of Abraham and Nancy Hanks his mother, then John D. Johnston's heredity, by such evidence as remains, was a good deal superior to Abraham Lincoln's. Their environment was identical from 1819 until Lincoln came of age. Prior to 1819, Johnston's environment easily was the better. Yet it was Johnston who might have been the shiftless, roving Tom Lincoln's boy.

Now that the Marxists have made Abraham Lincoln their own, will they give us the economic interpretation of John D. Johnston and his stepbrother?

A Modern Neanderthal?

The physical likenesses between Maurice Tillet, a professional wrestler afflicted with acromegaly, and the prehistoric Neanderthal man have suggested to scientists that the early race of ancient Europe may have suffered from glandular maladjustment. (*Life,* March 4.) While most victims of overfunctioning of the pituitary gland become weak as babies, M. Tillet, a former officer in the French Navy, is the most powerful man the anthropologists of Harvard University have ever met. Prof. Carleton Coon thinks the wrestler might be a "throwback" to Paleolithic times. Tillet's body shows many of the physical characteristics of the Neanderthal man as reconstructed from skeletal remains. Without fat, he weighs 276 pounds; only 5 feet eight and a half inches tall, he has a chest measurement of 47 inches. His enlarged head, hammer-jaw, big nose and gigantic hands and feet are symptoms of acromegaly. Following are the characteristics of the Neanderthal race as given by Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn:

> An enormous head placed upon a short and thick trunk, with limbs very short and thick-set; the shoulders broad and stooping . . . arms relatively short . . . hands extremely large . . . enormous development of the face. (*Men of the Old Stone Age,* p. 243-4.)

Current of Efflux

The hope that the Neanderthal man might be a "missing link" between man and anthropoid faded with the knowledge that this

paleolithic species was distinctly human, with large brain capacity. Dr. Osborn notes (as H. P. B. points out in *The Secret Doctrine* II, 168 fn.) that the brain capacity of Neanderthal skulls averages larger than many modern Frenchmen, ranging from 1296 to 1723 cubic centimeters. It would have been obvious to any but Darwin-inspired materialists that the brutish Neanderthals were rather a degraded race than representatives of a step in the supposed ascending line of human evolution. There is nothing improbable in the theory that the early cave-dwellers of Europe suffered from a glandular disease. They were, says H. P. B., of Atlantean and Africo-Atlantean stocks, on whom *the cyclic impulse downwards* weighed heavily—the incubus of *Atlantean Karma* was upon them (*S. D.* II, 740-1).

"APE"-ANCESTOR'S MYTHICAL SUCCESSOR

The suggestion that the Neanderthals were not typical of prehistoric humanity, but only diseased offshoots of the human family, should help to dispel the popular impression that man developed from some anthropoid ancestor whom the Neanderthals were thought to resemble. This residual belief, inherited from nineteenth century theory and fostered by pseudo-scientists, has no place in modern anthropology. As Waldemar Kaempffert wrote recently:

> The theory that man is descended from an anthropoid ape has been so thoroughly shot to pieces that only the fundamentalists believe that evolutionists believe in it. Years ago it was decided that man and the anthropoids stemmed from some common, unknown ancestor, so that the gorilla, orang and the chimpanzee are cousins rather than ancestors. . . . Prof. W. E. LeGros Clark, one of Great Britain's most distinguished anthropologists, expressed the opinion that the resemblance between man and the gorilla or chimpanzee could be regarded as a case of parallelism. (New York *Times,* Sept. 3, 1939.)

"UNITY OF TYPE"

"Parallelism" means the development of similar characteristics in two species which are genetically independent. The monkeys, it was once thought, evolved from the more primitive lemurs, fossils of monkey-like lemurs being evidence for this theory. But then it was found that true monkeys had existed long before the age of the fossil lemurs, and consequently the lemurs could not be the monkey's ancestors. Parallelism, as a theoretical solution of this difficulty, is not far from occult truth:

> When it is borne in mind that all forms which now people the earth, are so many variations on *basic types* originally thrown off by the MAN of the Third and Fourth Round, such an evolutionist argument as that insisting on the "unity of structural plan" characterising all vertebrates, loses its edge. The basic types referred to were very few in number in comparison with the multitude of organisms to which they ultimately gave rise; but a general unity of type has, nevertheless, been preserved throughout the ages. The economy of Nature does not sanction the co-existence of several utterly opposed "ground plans" of organic evolution on one planet. (*S. D.* II, 683.)

While discoveries of parallelism have helped to end dogmatic pronouncements on the identity of man's ancestors or near relations in the animal kingdom, the belief that man and ape had a common ancestor remains unshaken. This theory will be particularly difficult to disprove, because it rests, not upon fossil or other objective scientific evidence subject to review, but upon generalized preconceptions of materialism. Belief in a common ancestor for ape and man—a species of "relatively small and agile animals," in Prof. LeGros Clark's view, from which man and the chimpanzee, gorilla, orang, etc., diverged—is not a scientific theory supported by evidence: it is a state of mind.

"TAKEN FOR GRANTED"

Despite the fact that no evolutionist can explain *how* man evolved from an animal species, nor point to any *specific* evidence of such a line of descent, there is no other theory more firmly rooted in modern scientific thought. A paragraph from *The Human Comedy* by James Harvey Robinson, father of the "New History," will illustrate the point of view:

> It is true, the biologists have, many of them, given up what *they* call "Darwinism"; they have surrendered Spencer's notion of the hereditary transmission of acquired characters, and they even use the word "evolution" timidly and with many reservations. *But this does not mean that they have any doubts that mankind is a species of animal, sprung in some mysterious and as yet unexplained manner from extinct wild creatures of the forests and plains.* This they simply take for granted; for, unlike the public at large, they distinguish carefully between the varied and impressive evidence which appears to confirm man's animalhood and the several theories which have been advanced from time to time. . . . As time has gone on the facts which compel anyone acquainted with them to accept

> man's essentially animal nature have become more abundant and unmistakable, while many of the older theories of evolution have, as a result of further study and increasing knowledge, shown themselves to a great extent untenable. Much light has been cast of late on the history of life, but in some respects it seems more mysterious than ever before (pp. 23-4).

Man Was Never An Animal

The origin of physical man must remain "mysterious" for all scientists who refuse to consider the occult doctrine of primeval root types which, at the midway point of evolution, passed from the astral into the physical, then becoming subject to the differentiating agencies of nature studied by modern biologists. (*S. D.* II, 736.)

> The human form—so called, because it is the vehicle (under whatever shape) of the *divine* man—is, as so intuitionally remarked by the author of "Esoteric Studies," the *new type,* at the beginning of every Round, "as man can never be, so he never has been, manifested in a shape belonging to the animal kingdom *in esse.*" The author proceeds, "he never formed part of that kingdom. Derived, only derived, from the most finished class of the latter, a new human form must always have been the *new* type of the *cycle.* . . . " (*S. D.* II, 290.)

Partiality of Science

Although man very evidently possesses an animal nature, it does not follow from this that he is *essentially* an animal, as Dr. Robinson and his scientific authorities would have us believe. It is possible to accept the "varied and impressive evidence" on which the noted historian dwells so insistently and still call into question his interpretation of this evidence and his neglect of other matters of equal importance. One cannot look at the facts relating only to the physical man and hope to explain the whole being. There are other facts of equal prominence and far more significance to be considered. Dr. Kirtley F. Mather, professor of geology at Harvard, making this point in "The Future of Man," an article in the *Scientific Monthly* for March, writes almost as a theosophist:

> Ideas and ideals are powerful determining factors in the world today, and amongst them the ideal of freedom for the individual in the midst of social restraint is the most vital and compelling of all. Though it baffle our scientific tools for measurement, it is none the less a reality. It is in the yearning for freedom, the love of beauty, the search for truth, the

> recognition of moral law and in the awareness of spiritual forces that human nature is distinguished from all other sorts of nature. Man shares with other animals the need for satisfactory economics, for adequate food and shelter, for the goods essential to existence, but his needs transcend these physical factors because his nature differs from theirs. Probably nine-tenths of all the words that have been used since the dawn of speech in reference to "human nature" have referred to those elements in the nature of man which are shared with other animals rather than to those which are man's unique possession. It would be far better to concentrate upon the latter and thus to distinguish human nature from animal nature. . . . If man attempts to live by bread alone, mankind commits collective suicide. Apparently the best and perhaps the only chance for mankind to succeed in the quest for security is through progress in the art of living on a high spiritual plane rather than through exclusive attention to the science of existence on a purely physical level.

A New Problem for Anthropology

Recognition of these godlike attributes in man does not prevent Dr. Mather from tracing them to "a time only about sixty million years ago when gregarious instincts became clearly evident among placental mammals." But even if evolutionists continue to imagine that a Buddha or a Christ is the crowning glory of some primeval tarsioid, the hopelessly speculative character of this view will probably turn the direction of research from a fruitless study of origins to the more pressing problems of the present day. After a generation of compounding the mysteries of human origins, the wells of Darwinian inspiration have run dry; anthropologists may find a more satisfying occupation in facing the great issue proposed by Dr. Mather:

> Perhaps the most important fact concerning the life of man today is this fact of interdependence. . . . The very solution of the physical problems which man encounters in his attempt to maintain his foothold upon the earth brings him all the more forcefully into bruising contact with psychical and spiritual problems that must also be solved if he is to continue his existence on this planet. The critical question for the twentieth century is: How can two or three billion human beings be satisfactorily organized for the wise use and equitable distribution of resources which are abundant enough for all but are unevenly scattered over the face of the earth? Clearly, the future of man depends upon finding and applying the correct answer to that specific but far-reaching question.

That is not the real question, but it is a question far more constructive in its possibilities than the one that has dominated anthropological studies for nearly a hundred years: "How can we prove man an animal?" Working on the problem of economic justice, anthropologists may be led to an honest investigation of the nature of justice itself, and of moral law, and finally, perhaps, to ask themselves the question: How can we prove man a god?

INSTRUMENT OF FREEDOM

This Constitution of Ours, by Florence E. Allen, Judge of the U. S. Circuit Court of Appeals, is a book of great practical value to all American citizens who would understand the principles and underlying philosophy of their government. (Putnam, 1940, $2.00.) As William Allen White says on the jacket, this book "should be required reading in every American high school and college." Judge Allen presents, in five parts, a study of the origins of the Constitution, its ideals and objectives, and the characteristics and problems of democracy in action. No American can read this book without feeling the same call to duty that inspired its writer. An appendix gives the text of the Constitution with a useful index to its principal provisions.

For the theosophist, the particular merit of *This Constitution of Ours* lies in its insistence on individual responsibility. While the Founding Fathers performed a work of genius in writing the Constitution, freedom does not flow automatically from any document; the *spirit* of the laws is not self-perpetuating. In Judge Allen's words:

> . . . liberty cannot be caged into a document and handed on ready made to the next generation. Each generation must re-create liberty for its own times. Here in America we inherited an instrument apt for shaping freedom. Whether or not we establish freedom rests with ourselves.

KNOWLEDGE IS NEEDED

"Faith" in the Constitution is not enough. Americans must fortify their faith with knowledge of the principles of the Constitution, and with a willingness to assume the obligations it imposes upon the citizen. If they fail in this, democracy must fail. The apathy of Americans is the greatest menace to American freedom.

> Greed and self-interest [Judge Allen writes] have studied the Constitution more carefully than have we, the people. Their

> purpose has been, not to forward the great intent as the people should have, but to thwart that intent. A child stumbles and errs in applying the multiplication table, but much of our stumbling in applying the principles of justice and general welfare is unforgivable because our error has been in not understanding the principles themselves.

A great destiny awaits the race that is forming on the North American continent. Here, within the matrix of political freedom, may be born the deeper consciousness of *what that freedom is for.* Each degree of freedom achieved by humanity must become the foundation for freedom of a higher order. Judge Allen's book offers needed warnings which have their complement in sound encouragement and the hope of fulfillment for Paine's vision: "a new order of ages, a republic of conscience in which mankind shall be freed forever from war and from the threat of war." Practical application of the principles set forth in *This Constitution of Ours* would go far toward establishing a Republic of Conscience in America. The assumption of responsibility and the self-reliant execution of present duties are the only means to that knowledge which is father to the higher freedom of soul.

Geneticists Grow "Practical"

The "Geneticists' Manifesto," formulated at Edinburgh last August by delegates to the seventh International Genetics Congress in answer to the question of a journalist, "How could world's population improve most effectively genetically?" shows a sober concern for social realities and is guilty of none of the fanaticism found in most eugenic propaganda. Prepared by such noted biologists as J. B. S. Haldane, Julian Huxley, Lancelot Hogben, J. Needham, H. J. Muller, and some others, it may be taken as representative of the best of orthodox scientific opinion in this field. The Manifesto, which appeared in the *Journal of Heredity* for September, 1939, begins by making clear that the question involves much more than "purely biological" problems. "Effective genetic improvement of mankind," say the writers, "is dependent upon major changes in social conditions and correlative changes in human attitudes." Actually, the Geneticists' Manifesto is an admission that the results most frequently promised for eugenic measures must themselves be first realized in other ways, before the eugenic solution can be applied at all!

PRELIMINARY STEPS

Among the reforms the Manifesto says are prerequisite to genetic improvement is the achievement of "economic and social conditions which provide approximately equal opportunities for all members of society instead of stratifying them from birth into classes with widely different privileges." (The genetic worth of individuals cannot be measured until modifying factors of environment are equalized.) Another necessity is "the removal of race prejudices and of the unscientific doctrine that good or bad genes are the monopoly of particular peoples or of persons with features of a given kind." This would involve the elimination of "the conditions which make for war and economic exploitation" through "some effective sort of federation of the whole world, based on the common interests of all its peoples." In other words, when universal brotherhood is established, the geneticists will then be in a position to "improve" the race by scientific breeding!

A CURIOUS DREAM

While maintaining that "raising the level of the average population nearly to that of the highest now existing in isolated individuals, in regard to physical well-being, intelligence and temperamental qualities, is an achievement that would—so far as purely genetic considerations are concerned—be physically possible within a comparatively small number of generations, the geneticists say that this desirable accomplishment can come about only "when men's minds are turned from war and the struggle for the elementary means of subsistence to larger aims, pursued in common." The authors of the Manifesto conclude:

> The day when economic reconstruction will reach the stage where such human forces will be released is not yet, but it is the task of this generation to prepare for it, and all the steps along the way will represent a gain, not only for the possibilities of the ultimate genetic improvement of man, to a degree seldom dreamed of hitherto, but at the same time, more directly, for human mastery over those more immediate evils which are so threatening to our modern civilization.

To these more immediate objectives of the geneticists, the Theosophist, can heartily subscribe, in full recognition, however, that when the Golden Age required for application of "genetic improvement" is reached, there will be small chance of any scientist desiring to treat human beings as biological units. The scientists of that day will know better methods of improvement than the merely biological!